

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00486 01 OF 02 131803Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 INRE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-13 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ERDE-00 /086 W

----- 048316

O P 131717Z OCT 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1788

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0486

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS OF OCT 12, 1976

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE OCT 12 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE FRG REP, NETHERLANDS REP AND US REP, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS TARASOV AND SHUSTOV, POLISH REP DABROWA AND GDR REP OESER.

2. THE SESSION COVERED FAMILIAR GROUND. THERE WERE SOME NEW NUANCES IN EASTERN STATEMENTS REGARDING STAGE ONE COMMITMENTS BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US REGARDING THEIR REDUCTIONS IN STAGE TWO. BUT IT IS TOO EARLY TO DETERMINE WHETHER THESE LIMITED SHIFTS OF FORMULATION HAVE ANY SIGNIFICANCE. WESTERN REPS AGAIN EXPLAINED THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WESTERN PROPOSALS OF DEC 16 AS AN EQUITABLE BASIS FOR AGREEMENT.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00486 01 OF 02 131803Z

THEY POINTED OUT THAT THE EAST WAS UNREALISTIC IN URGING WESTERN

ACCEPTANCE OF A REDUCTION APPROACH WHICH WOULD CONTRACTUALIZE EASTERN SUPERIORITY IN MILITARY MANPOWER AND MAJOR ARMAMENTS. THEY COMMENTED THAT, ALTHOUGH THE FEB 19 EASTERN PROPOSAL MOVED TOWARDS THE WESTERN POSITION AS REGARDS SEQUENCE OF REDUCTIONS AND THE NEED FOR TWO SEPARATE AGREEMENTS, IT DID NOT REPRESENT ANY MOVE TOWARDS THE CENTRAL ASPECT OF THE WESTERN POSITION ON PHASING, THE REQUIREMENT FOR A PRIOR EASTERN COMMITMENT TO A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING ON GROUND FORCES AT REDUCED LEVELS, AND A STAGE ONE US-SOVIET REDUCTION MAKING SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS TOWARDS THAT OBJECTIVE AND TOWARDS REDUCTION OF THE EASTERN TANK SUPERIORITY.

3. EASTERN REPS PRESENTED SOME VIEWS OF THEIR OWN ON POINTS WHICH EASTERN AND WESTERN POSITIONS SHOWED COMMON ELEMENTS BUT DID NOT PURSUE FURTHER THE EARLIER PROPOSAL THAT BOTH SIDES SHOULD ENGAGE IN SUCH AN EFFORT. EASTERN REPS CRITICIZED THE MILITARY VALUE OF THE WESTERN DEC 16 PROPOSALS, IN THIS CONNECTION EMPHASIZING CONTINUED WESTERN INSISTENCE ON RESTRICTING WESTERN ARMAMENTS REDUCTIONS TO THE US NUCLEAR WITHDRAWALS THE WEST HAD PROPOSED.

4. EASTERN REPS PLACED GREATEST EMPHASIS ON NEED FOR A COMMITMENT BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE UNITED STATES AS TO THE SCOPE AND TIMING OF THEIR REDUCTIONS IN A SECOND STAGE. EASTERN REPS APPEARED TO MOVE SLIGHTLY IN THE DIRECT OF INDICATING IN A NON-COMMITTAL AND VAGUE WAY THAT, ALTHOUGH THEY ADHERED TO THEIR OWN VIEWS THAT REDUCTIONS IN BOTH STAGES SHOULD BE BY UNITS AND SHOULD INCLUDE ARMAMENTS, THE EXACT CONTENT OF A STAGE ONE COMMITMENT BY DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US AND USSR SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION AND THAT WESTERN PARTICIPANTS SHOULD PRESENT THEIR OWN VIEWS AS TO A STAGE ONE COMMITMENT ON SCOPE AND TIMING OF THEIR OWN PHASE II REDUCTIONS. EASTERN REPS DID NOT ON THIS OCCASION SPECIFY, AS THEY HAVE IN THE PAST, THAT THERE SHOULD BE INDIVIDUAL NATIONAL COMMITMENTS IN STAGE ONE FOR STAGE TWO REDUCTIONS. INSTEAD, ON THIS OCCASION, THEY USED THE FORMULA THAT EACH DIRECT PARTICIPANT SHOULD INDICATE THAT IT WOULD BE PREPARED IN THE SECOND STAGE TO MAKE REDUCTIONS COMPARABLE TO ITS OWN MILITARY STRENGTH IN THE AREA.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00486 01 OF 02 131803Z

5. WESTERN REPS RESPONDED THAT THE WEST HAD ALREADY INDICATED THE GENERAL SCOPE OF REDUCTIONS IN BOTH PHASES AND THAT A DECISION ON TIMING WAS INAPPROPRIATE IF STAGE TWO NEGOTIATIONS WERE TO HANDLE ISSUES OF GENUINE SUBSTANCE.

6. GDR REP LED OFF. HE SAID EASTERN PARTICIPANTS CONSIDERED THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE NEGOTIATIONS JUSTIFIED AN EFFORT TO ELABORATE CONCRETE PROVISIONS OF A FUTURE AGREEMENT. HE

SAID THAT, IN THE EASTERN VIEW, THE TWO SIDES HAD IN COMMON THE FOLLOWING POINTS: (A) DIVISION OF THE REDUCTION PROCESS INTO TWO STAGES; (B) REDUCTION OF SOVIET AND AMERICAN FORCES IN A FIRST STAGE; (C) IN A SECOND STAGE, THE FORCES OF THE REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPATING STATES WOULD BE REDUCED; (D) A FIRST STAGE AGREEMENT WOULD INCLUDE DETAILED OBLIGATIONS ONLY OF THE US AND USSR; (E) THE FIRST STAGE ALSO HAD TO PROVIDE GENERAL OBLIGATIONS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY THE REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS CONCERNING THE REDUCTION OF THEIR FORCES IN A SECOND STAGE; (F) THAT GUARANTEES ON THIS TOPIC SHOULD BE PROVIDED IN A FIRST STAGE AGREEMENT; AND (G) THAT NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS SHOULD BE REDUCED. GDR REP ASKED WESTERN REPS TO CONFIRM THAT THERE WAS AGREEMENT ON THESE POINTS. WESTERN REPS DID NOT ADDRESS THESE REMARKS BY GDR REP. GDR REP THEN PRESENTED EASTERN FEB 19 PROPOSAL AS ADEQUATE BASIS FOR AGREEMENT.

7. NETHERLANDS REP POINTED OUT THAT THE EAST WAS NOT REALISTIC IN EXPECTING THAT WESTERN PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE WILLING TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WHICH WOULD CONTRACTUALLY PLACE THEM IN AN ENDURING POSITION OF INFERIORITY WITHIN THE AREA, WITH EASTERN SUPERIORITY IN MANPOWER AND MAJOR ARMAMENTS CONTRACTUALIZED. THE RESULTING MILITARY ADVANTAGES FOR THE EAST WOULD BE FURTHER ENHANCED BY EASTERN GEOGRAPHIC ADVANTAGES. WHEREAS THE EAST WAS ATTEMPTING TO CONTRACTUALIZE ITS ADVANTAGE, THE WEST WAS PROPOSING AN OUTCOME OF PARITY WHICH WOULD NOT ENTAIL UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE FOR EITHER SIDE.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00486 02 OF 02 131811Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 INRE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-13 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ERDE-00 /086 W

----- 048420

O P 131717Z OCT 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1789

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY
USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY
USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0486

FROM US REP MBFR

8. POLISH REP DELIVERED LONG CRITICISM OF MILITARY VALUE OF WESTERN DEC 16 PROPOSAL. HE PLACED GREATEST EMPHASIS ON THE POINT THAT BECAUSE THE WEST RESTRICTED REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS ONLY TO CERTAIN US NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS AND PROPOSED NEITHER REDUCTIONS OR LIMITATIONS OF WESTERN EUROPEAN HOLDINGS OF THE SAME NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS NOR TO REDUCE OR LIMIT ANY OTHER CONVENTIONAL ARMAMENTS, THE WESTERN REDUCTION APPROACH WOULD LEAVE FREE SCOPE FOR A CONTINUED ARMS RACE IN THE AREA.

9. US REP POINTED OUT THAT THE EAST CONTINUED TO FAIL TO CORRECTLY EVALUATE THE MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WESTERN DEC 16 PROPOSALS WHICH WERE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT MOVE MADE BY EITHER SIDE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS SINCE BOTH SIDES PUT DOWN THEIR ORIGINAL POSITIONS IN NOV 1973, WHILE THE EASTERN PROPOSAL OF FEB 19 COULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS IN ANY WAY COMPARABLE IN IMPORTANCE AND SCOPE TO THE DEC 1975 WESTERN PROPOSALS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00486 02 OF 02 131811Z

10. TARASOV CLAIMED THE EASTERN FEB 19 PROPOSAL FULFILLED WESTERN REQUIREMENT FOR PRIOR SOVIET AND US REDUCTIONS TO CREATE AN ATMOSPHERE OF CONFIDENCE ENABLING DECISIONS BY WESTERN EUROPEAN AND CANADIAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ON THEIR STAGE TWO REDUCTIONS. HE SAID THE SOVIETS WERE UNWILLING TO REDUCE THEIR FORCES IN A FIRST STAGE WITHOUT CLEAR GUARANTEES BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE UNITED STATES THAT THEY WOULD REDUCE THEIR FORCES IN A SECOND STAGE. NO ASSURANCES OF THIS KIND HAD BEEN PROVIDED BY NATO COUNTRIES TO DATE.

11. THE FRG REP POINTED OUT THAT THE EASTERN FEB 19 PROPOSAL MADE NO MOVE TOWARDS THE CENTRAL ASPECT OF THE WESTERN POSITION ON PHASING, ACCEPTANCE OF A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING IN GROUND FORCES AND OVERALL MILITARY MANPOWER, AND AGREEMENT TO SUBSTANTIAL FIRST STAGE REDUCTIONS WHICH WOULD MOVE IN THE DIRECTION OF PARITY AND REDUCE EASTERN TANK SUPERIORITY. HE POINTED OUT THESE REQUIREMENTS WERE JUSTIFIED BY THE OVERALL NEGOTIATING SITUATION AND EXPLAINED HOW THE EASTERN REQUIREMENT FOR ACROSS-THE-BOARD ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS WOULD CONTRACTUALIZE EASTERN SUPERIORITY IN MANY FIELDS.

12. IN THE ENSUING DEBATE, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS, LED BY TARASOV, INSISTED THAT IT WAS UP TO THE WEST TO PROVIDE THE EAST WITH SOME CLEAR IDEA OF THE TIMING AND SCOPE OF REDUCTIONS BY WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US IN STAGE TWO. THEY SAID THE EAST HAD DONE SO FOR EASTERN PARTICIPANTS. NOW, IT WAS UP TO THE WEST TO MAKE ITS OWN POSITION ON THIS ISSUE CLEAR. WESTERN REPS POINTED OUT THAT THE WEST HAD ALREADY INDICATED THE GENERAL DIMENSIONS OF OVERALL REDUCTIONS TO REACH THE COMMON CEILING AND ARGUED THAT, IF STAGE TWO NEGOTIATIONS WERE TO DEAL WITH ISSUES OF REAL SUBSTANCE, IT WOULD NOT BE FEASIBLE TO AGREE IN ADVANCE TO A TIMETABLE FOR THEIR CONCLUSION. END SUMMARY.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: NEGOTIATIONS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 OCT 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: KelleyW0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976MBFRV00486
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760384-1239
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19761057/aaaabxle.tel
Line Count: 235
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: KelleyW0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 APR 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <27 APR 2004 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <29 JUL 2004 by KelleyW0>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS OF OCT 12, 1976
TAGS: PARM, XT, XH, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006